

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

| | | | |
|---------------|---|--------------------|-------------------|
| PIN | 5224 | COUNTY | Multiple Counties |
| APPLICANT | El Dorado Irrigation District | AMOUNT REQUESTED | \$500,000 |
| PROJECT TITLE | Cosumnes, American, Bear, & Yuba Rivers (CABY) Integrated Regional Water Management Plan | TOTAL PROJECT COST | \$797,042 |

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Develop an integrated regional water management planning process to support the common and individual objectives for the region and to be used as a model for other regions of the Sierra Nevada.

WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

Score: 12

Comment: The work plan is specific for several elements including watershed modeling, data review and management, and work item submittals. The work plan, budget, and schedule are consistent with respect to work items and sequence of work items. The IRWMP will be adopted by January 1, 2007. The proposal would be stronger if there was some description of how the existing information would be used to develop the IRWMP such as identifying existing data, analyzing for data gaps, identifying issues that can be resolved using the integrated approach to watershed management. The budget looks reasonable, however, no supporting documentation (i.e., cost justification, estimates, etc.) is provided.

DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: The proposed region for the CABY IRWMP is well-defined and justified, and includes the service areas of the five water agencies participating in the regional group. The application includes maps showing water related infrastructure and agencies involved. Land-use is not clearly addressed in the section. That is appropriate for development as it addresses a unique set of water resources issues as opposed to more urbanized areas on the valley floor. However, the rationale behind establishment of the region boundaries is not clearly established.

OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 10

Comment: Preliminary objectives are identified by the applicant after consideration of existing water management plans and watershed stewardship documents. An extensive list of objectives is provided in the application aimed at providing a reliable supply of high quality water for the population and the environment. The applicant provides tables linking components of the plan with statewide priorities in the application.

INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 8

Comment: The applicant provides a list of water management strategies. They propose to prioritize these strategies for implementation considering objectives, available data and achievement of multiple benefits through stakeholder review. Table 9 correlates the relationship between water management strategies and IRWMP standards. However, specifics are lacking and the applicant does not adequately demonstrate an understanding of how the selected water management strategies can be implemented together to produce some synergistic effects.

IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 6

Comment: The applicant states that an inventory of monitoring and assessment activities will be done, recognizing the need for coordination and integration. The applicant also states that performance measures will be developed to ensure the IRWMP objectives are being met. The IRWMP will also include specific performance measures to ensure it is meeting the specific objectives and goals. At this time, no specific NPS projects have been identified for implementation. Once specific NPS actions and projects are identified and prioritized, appropriate management measures and practices and implementation responsibilities and schedule will be established. There is little detail about how, after adoption, the IRWM plan will be integrated with local water management plans and efforts.

IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 6

Comment: The proposal describes primarily administrative benefits with only general reference to water supply or water quality benefits. No impacts are discussed in the narrative. CEQA is mentioned. The score would have been higher if plans for CEQA evaluations were incorporated into the planning rather than waiting for an implementation project to begin.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: The work plan provides a list of relevant studies and sources of data and identifies some of the scientific uncertainties and data gaps in the CABY region. The work plan states that additional tools will be developed. However, a detailed characterization of the existing data, models, tools and proposed methods of technical analysis, and recommendations for integration and coordination, is lacking.

DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: The proposal describes the process for determining the process for managing and disseminating data in detail both in the narrative and in the work plan. The work plan is deficient in that it doesn't describe data management in the context of IRWMP implementation. The focus is on coordination, planning, and stakeholder involvement and doesn't contain adequate technical detail. Data collection, management, and technical analysis are insufficient and not well documented in the work plan.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 5

Comment: The proposal describes a comprehensive plan for obtaining broad stakeholder participation and input. The proposal describes the need to include tribes and family farmers in the planning process. The applicant identifies an interactive process for reviewing committee membership and including under or un-represented stakeholder interests.

DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: Tribal representatives and small family farmers are identified and included in the process. The IRWMP will target additional ethnic and lower income organizations and constituencies in the region for recruitment and participation in the Public Forum and the Planning Committee. To communicate with constituencies who sometimes do not have access to the Internet, the IRWMP will supplement electronic communication with regular mail where appropriate. However, this criterion is only marginally addressed. The proposal fails to document water supply and water quality needs of disadvantaged communities.

RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: Data review of existing documents is discussed in the narrative and addressed in the work items marginally. However there is no discussion of how future local planning efforts will be taken into consideration or become integrated with the IRWMP. There is also no mention of the Proposed Lower Yuba River Accord. It is also of concern that Yuba County Water Agency (YCWA) was not part of the Grant Launch Team for the IRWMP; and that YCWA instead has submitted its own grant application (Pin # 4616).

AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: Several agencies are listed among the stakeholders in Table 2. However, the proposed IRWMP lacks detail of how it will facilitate coordination with local land use planning decision makers and facilitate coordination with State and federal regulatory agencies.

TOTAL SCORE: 68